

April 9, 1975

CLERK: Mr. President, I move that the Clerk be directed to request the Governor to return LB 307. Signed Senator George.

SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Senator George.

SENATOR GEORGE: Mr. Speaker, we have already passed on Final Reading LB 307 and sent it to the Governor's office. I have made the motion to bring it back from the Governor's office and once we have it back, then I would like to make a motion to get it back on Select File for a specific amendment. You all have probably seen the article in yesterday's Lincoln paper entitled, Very Broad Bill Could Shift Power. I could possibly, if you haven't seen it, quote one section of the bill, LB 307, says, "Any municipal corporation may contract with any persons to provide public services." This, of course, means counties, townships, cities and villages and there is a reference made to the Attorney General who said the bill could be used by local governments to contract to build roads, construct buildings, or almost anything else. I don't think that that was the intention when we passed LB 307 and, therefore, I would like to see that we get it back for specific amendment to narrow down those powers.

SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion? If not, the motion to return LB...Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Senator Marvel a question.

SPEAKER: Do you yield?

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Well, Senator Marvel, since this is your bill, I would be interested in your comments about your desire with the bill and also the intention of the bill.

SENATOR MARVEL: I am looking at the Black Book, Mr. President, because this question came up yesterday when I was amazed to learn that the Attorney General was quoted as saying that the bill probably goes further than they intended. This bill was introduced on the 21st of January. It was heard by the Committee on the 14th of February. It was passed to General File on the 6th of March. Finally signed by the Governor the 7th of April and I...when I make these statements, I am not at all critical of the Government Committee. I am simply trying to set up dates. From the 21st of January until yesterday, there seemed to be no objection to this bill and I was amazed that the Attorney General's office, at this late date, finds an objection and I guess I am not sure what the source of it is. Now, after I make that statement...in other words, I think in fairness to me, the introducer, and the people who are interested in this type of legislation, if somebody had an objection, they would come forth before three and a half months had expired. Since they didn't seem to, I guess I am at a loss to know why, at this late date, this is brought up. Now after saying that, it is perfectly all right with me if the bill is brought back with the understanding that those fine people who are interested in Meals on Wheels aren't jeopardized. This bill, as far as I am concerned, is simply set up for the purposes of allowing political subdivisions, and in this case we are talking about the city of Hastings, has the right, if the officials so desire, to participate in